

REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS

This *Amendment and Response to Office Action* is filed in response to the Office Action of May 5, 2008. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-17, 20-21, and 23-24 are pending. Claims 1, 2 and 14 have been amended and claims 12-13, 15-17, 20-21 and 23-24 have been cancelled in this response. Applicants submit that all the claims, as amended herein, are distinguishable from the prior art of record for at least the following reasons:

1. The *Office Action* states that claims 1-6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,007,209 (“*Pelka*”). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended herein overcome the rejection.

The invention described by amended claim 1 is directed to an illumination device for display systems comprising (I) a circuit board, (II) a plurality of light sources distributed on the circuit board with a light distribution surface area, (III) at least one light diffusing plate optically coupled to the plurality of light sources and having a light incidence area for receiving light from the light sources, wherein the light distribution surface area is at least greater than the light incidence area of the at least one light-diffusing plate, and (IV) device case enclosing the plurality of light sources, wherein the device case comprises a plurality of sidewalls having an inner surface configured to reflect light from the plurality of light sources, wherein each sidewall of the device case and the circuit board form an angle in the range of about 60 degrees to less than 90 degrees. Specifically, amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that each sidewall of the device case and the circuit board form an angle in the range of about 60 degrees to less than 90 degrees such that the present invention can provide a more uniform light display at the edge.

Pelka, however, does not disclose or suggest that a circuit board, a plurality of light sources distributed on the circuit board and each sidewall of the device case and the circuit board form an angle in the range of about 60 degrees to less than 90 degrees. *Pelka* only proposes that “the backlight apparatus 10 is comprised of a first and second series of red, blue and green light emitting diodes (LEDs) 12 and 13, located within a housing 14...”, *See Col. 3, lines 31-33*, and the housing 14 comprises a diffusively reflecting cavity having an interior cavity bottom wall 15, and interior cavity side walls 16, *See Col. 3, lines 59-61*. In other words, *Pelka* teaches that part of the housing 14 is curvy and forms the cavity side walls 16. The cavity side walls 16 would not diffusively reflect and illuminate the aperture if the curvy angle (between interior cavity bottom wall 15 and interior cavity side walls 16) is in the range of about 60 degrees to less than 90 degrees because the light from LED 12 is optically coupled to the interior cavity side walls 16 but not the interior cavity bottom wall 15. Therefore, the technical feature of claim 1 is different and novel from Pelkas’.

In addition, as disclosed in Fig. 3-5 and column 4, lines 16-27 of Pelkas, “The channel 70 is formed by peripheral baffles 72 that extend from the edge of the aperture 18 a short distance into the cavity on each side thereof. The baffles 72 thus extend around the entire perimeter of the aperture 18.“ Accordingly, the reflected light of bottom wall 15 from the LEDs 12 would be shielded by the baffles 72 at the edge. Hence, the backlight apparatus 10 would display non-uniform light distribution, especially weak at the edge. However, all of the LEDs in the claimed invention are distributed on circuit board, and the inclined sidewall reflects peripheral light to the edge. Therefore, the light distribution at the edge of the backlight device would be more uniform than that of the backlight apparatus 10 in Pelkas. By the previous comparison, it is clear that the claimed invention is non-obvious to Pelkas.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patently distinguishable from the reference of *Pelka*. At least by virtue of their respective dependency on claim 1-6, 9 and 10 should also be patentable over *Pelka*.

2. The *Office Action* further states that claims 12, 13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,036,946 (“*Mosier*”). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended herein overcome the rejection.

Amended claim 14 discloses (I) the light distribution surface area has a length ‘M’ and the light guide plate has a length ‘B’ (II) each one of the plurality of light sources is separated from adjacent light sources by a pitch ‘G’ (III)the length ‘M’ is confined to the range defined by $(B + G) \leq M \leq (B + 3G)$.

First, *Takayanagi* fails to suggest that the light distribution surface area has a length ‘M’ and the light guide plate has a length ‘B’ and each one of the plurality of light sources is separated from adjacent light sources by a pitch ‘G’. *Takayanagi* describes that $G = \left[n_3 + \frac{(r^3)}{2} \right]$ and the B of the present invention can be as the n_3 of *Takayanagi*, the M of the present invention can be as the m_3 of *Takayanagi*. Therefore, $(B+G)$ will greater than M, and a person of ordinary skill in the art could not have recognized the desirability of effects and technical features of claim 14 upon reading *Takayanagi* and *Pelka*.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is patently distinguishable from the reference over *Takayanagi* in view of *Pelka*.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that given the above amendments and remarks, all the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested. If further discussion of this amendment is required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below. No fees are believed to be with this response, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 50-3420 (reference 87159200-242006 Valoir).

Dated: July 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Tamsen Valoir/
Tamsen Valoir, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 41,417
BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP
Pennzoil Place, South Tower
711 Louisiana, Suite 3400
Houston, TX 77002-2746
(713) 427-5007
(713) 427-5099 (Fax)